

Frank Liu  
304 S. Jones Blvd #3416  
Las Vegas, NV 89107  
818-835-0498  
[frank.liu.96@gmail.com](mailto:frank.liu.96@gmail.com)  
Pro Se Plaintiff

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**


Frank Liu  Plaintiff,  vs.  The Nielsen Company (US) LLC  and TNC US HOLDINGS,  Defendants.	<b>Case #1:22-cv-09084-JHR-OTW</b>  <b>LETTER TO JUDGE WANG IN RESPONSE TO ECF 120 and OBJECTION TO ECF 118 BASED ON MERGED COURTESY COPY DEFENDANTS PROVIDED LIU ON NOVEMBER 12, 2024</b>
--	--

Dear Judge Wang,

It wasn't until November 12, 2024 that Defendants *finally* provided Plaintiff courtesy copies of ECF 115 and 118. Regarding ECF 115, Plaintiff is OK if the Court strikes ECF 115.


However Plaintiff **OBJECTS** to Defendants' ECF 118 based on the merged courtesy copy Defendants provided Liu being low resolution which made some embedded images unreadable. For ECF 118, Defendants provided Liu one (1) merged PDF that is 7.11 MB that includes both ECF 118 and 118-1 as ONE document. Plaintiff will assume the courtesy copy (merged document) Defendants provided Plaintiff is of the same image resolution as the two separate documents Defendants filed under seal with the Court (as ECF 118 and 118-1) because Liu can not check on what resolution files were actually filed by Defendants because they are under seal and Liu does not have access.

Unfortunately, Defendants did not provide Liu the two separate docketed files (ECF 118 and 118-1), but instead provided Liu a merged/combined document that includes both documents as one PDF. The merged courtesy copy Defendants provided Liu, is of low quality. Here's a comparison - the left image is from page 62 of Defendants' merged courtesy copy. The image on the right is from page 44 of Plaintiff's ECF 89-1. Please Zoom in. The letter on the left is unreadable.



Because Defendants provided Liu a merged document, Plaintiff respectfully asks the Court to compare the images embedded in 89 and 89-1 with 118 and 118-1. If some of the images are unreadable in 118 and 118-1, but readable in 89 and 89-1, Plaintiff respectfully asks the Court to order Defendants to refile the documents with the original higher resolution. Plaintiff's ECF 89 was about 5.11 MB and ECF 89-1 was about 6.45 MB. Defendants should not be allowed to intentionally lower resolution of embedded images in their refileing because by doing so they are in essence, hiding evidence that did not need to be publicly redacted.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Frank Liu". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Dated 11/12/2024

Frank Liu

Pro Se Plaintiff